



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/482,099	01/13/2000	Kiyoshi Takei	Q57433	6543

7590 11/21/2003

Sughrue Mion Macpeak & Seas
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue N W
Washington, DC 20037-3202

EXAMINER

FLORES RUIZ, DELMA R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2828

DATE MAILED: 11/21/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

GA

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/482,099

Applicant(s)

TAKEI ET AL.

Examiner

Delma R. Flores Ruiz

Art Unit

2828

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.


- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4 and 5 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.


PAUL IP
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 – 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chen et al (5,982,804).

Regarding claim 1, Chen discloses a DFB type semiconductor laser device comprising; a laser part including an active layer (see Figs. 2 - 10 Character 11) and a clad layer (see Figs. 2 – 10, Characters 10 and 12) ; a grating layer (see Fig. 7 Character 20) mounted on said clad layer and having periodic apertures; an insulating layer (see Figs. 8 – 10, Character 21) mounted on said grating layer, said insulating layer including at least one elongated gap extending in a direction transverse to a grating of said grating layer and a metal electrode layer mounted on said insulating layer so as to contact through said aperture of said grating layer with said clad layer within said gap (said limitation only recites facts and features that are well known and

expected, the same features that essentially result from the use or application of a insulating layer including at least one elongated gap extending and said insulating layer so as to contact through said aperture of said grating layer with said clad layer within said gap , and therefore said limitations are said to be inherently disclosed in the teachings of Chen).

Regarding claim 2 Chen disclose a DFB type semiconductor laser device the active layer is composed of at least InGaAsP (Column 4, Lines 41 – 48)and a grating layer is composed of InGaAs (Column 8, Lines 16 – 46).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over of Chen et al (5,982,804) in view of Takemi et al (5,539,763).

Regarding claim 3 Chen discloses the claimed invention except for a clad layer has a thickness equal to or thinner than $0.5\mu\text{m}$. It would have been obvious at the time of applicant's invention, to combine Takemi of teaching a clad layer has a thickness equal to or thinner than $0.5\mu\text{m}$ with DFB type semiconductor laser because it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to clad layer has a thickness equal to or thinner than $0.5\mu\text{m}$, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or working ranges involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233.

Response to Arguments


Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 - 3 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicants amendments raised new issues that made necessary the new art to be applied and therefore, the arguments presented against Takiguchi et al are said to be moot due to the new grounds of rejection. Applicant's amendments have been fully addressed by the above-presented rejection.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Delma R. Flores Ruiz whose telephone number is (703) 308-6238. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul Ip can be reached on (703) 308-3098. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-7722.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-3431.


Delma R. Flores Ruiz
Examiner
Art Unit 2828


Paul Ip
Supervisor Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2828

DRFR/PI